REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated April 16, 2009. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims herein are made for the purpose of clarifying and more precisely claiming the invention. The present amendments to the claims are supported at various places in the Specification and Drawings as originally filed. For example, the present amendments are supported at lines 2-4 and 14-22 on page 7 of the Specification as originally filed.

No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 stands rejected for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Amendments to claim 1 herein are believed to meet all requirements in this regard.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 12-16, 18-19 and 24-25 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. Publication 2004/0008828 ("Coles") and U.S. Publication 2002/0038309 ("Perkins"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As previously noted, Coles discloses an information retrieval system for monitoring a conversation between two or more parties that automatically detects keywords used during the conversation. An information database is automatically searched for information relevant to the conversation based on the collected keywords. A keyword list and an information list are displayed on a workstation display in the Coles system to allow an agent user to manually select/deselect one or more of the detected keywords and/or retrieved information, in order to adjust the priority of the keywords and/or information. As keywords and/or information are selected/deselected by the agent user, the displayed keyword list and information list are

dynamically updated based on new priorities and/or how much time has passed since a keyword was mentioned in the conversation.

The workstations of Coles include a memory with a data base containing the dictionary of keywords used to match words recognized by the voice recognition circuit. The keywords within the Coles keyword dictionary are initially assigned weighted values. As words are recognized by the Coles voice recognition circuit, the words are dynamically matched to keywords within the keyword dictionary. The keywords recognized in Coles are initially compiled into the list displayed to the agent using the weights assigned to the keywords in the keyword dictionary. As the conversation proceeds, Coles teaches that when a keyword is matched more than once, the weight assigned to the keyword may be adjusted upward. Similarly, as the frequency at which a keyword is repeated increases, the weight assigned to the keyword is adjusted upward. Conversely, as the duration of time between usage of keywords increases, the weight assigned to the keyword is decreased. Thus, the displayed keyword list for a conversation in Coles is dynamically compiled and adjusted, and a revised keyword list display is dynamically created during the conversation without requiring direct input from the agent.

Perkins discloses a system for integrating one or more external systems. Perkins discloses in its Background that a desktop client application may provides a mechanism by which an agent can associate wrap-up codes with an interaction, and that wrap-up codes indicate what a call was regarding. Perkins also discloses the importance of capitalizing on opportunities, and that the desktop client may perform a very important function in a contact center by delivering the information that an agent needs to service a customer at the exact moment of contact. Perkins further teaches that when a customer or potential customer contacts your organization, this presents an opportunity to build a relationship, make more contacts, or make another sale.

Nowhere in the combination of <u>Coles</u> and <u>Perkins</u> is there described or suggested a

system or method for processing a received call, comprising:

> routing the received call to an agent;
> detecting a change of mode event prior to termination of said received call;
> responsive to said detecting said change of mode event, entering a muted command mode during which a caller of said call is prevented from hearing said agent speaking;
> ***receiving, during said muted command mode and prior to termination of said received call, at least one call description voice command from said agent; and***
> ***storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call in a database of call records associated with received calls, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, and wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call.*** (emphasis added)

as for example in the present independent claim 1. Neither <u>Coles</u> nor <u>Perkins</u> describes or

suggests storing an activity code received prior to termination of a received call in a data record

for the call. Moreover, neither <u>Coles</u> nor <u>Perkins</u> discloses or suggests associating such a

received activity code within one of a plurality of time periods occurring during the received call.

In contrast, <u>Coles</u> displays keywords detected during a call that may be used to retrieve and

prioritize information displayed to an agent during the call. The keywords in <u>Coles</u> during a

conversation are stored in a display list based on their associated weights (see paragraph 26), and

are used to retrieve other information to be displayed to the agent during the call (see paragraph

37). <u>Perkins</u> discloses that wrap up codes may be entered to indicate what a call was regarding.

As explained in Fig. 3 of the previously cited <u>Anderson</u>, such wrap up codes are entered after a

call is ended. Neither <u>Coles</u> nor <u>Perkins</u> provides any suggestion of even the desirability of

associating any kind of activity code with a time period within the received call. Accordingly,

nothing in the combination of <u>Perkins</u> and <u>Coles</u> discloses or suggests receiving, during said

muted command mode and prior to termination of said received call, at least one call description

voice command from said agent, and storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call in a database of call records associated with received calls, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, and wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call, as in the present independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Coles and Perkins does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. The combination of Coles and Perkins accordingly does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C 103 with regard to claims 1, 13 and 25. As to claims 2-4, 6-7, 12, 14-16, 18-19 and 24, they each depend from claims 1 and 13, and are patentable over the combination of Coles and Perkins for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 8-11 and 20-23 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Coles and Perkins further combined with U.S. Patent number 5,757,904 ("Anderson"). As noted in the previous response, Anderson describes classifying calls based on wrap-up codes, and teaches maintaining records that are associated with not with calls, as in the present independent claims, but instead with *customers* (see column 7, lines 10-26, i.e. "Mr. Allen's record"). Accordingly, the combination of Coles, Perkins and Anderson also does not disclose or suggest receiving, during said muted command mode and prior to termination of said received call, at least one call description voice command from said agent, and storing at least one activity code associated with said at least one call description voice command in a data record associated with said received call in a database of call records associated with received calls, wherein said at least one activity code describes said received call, and wherein said activity code is associated with one of a plurality of time periods occurring during said received call, as in the present

independent claim 1.   The combination of <u>Coles</u>, <u>Perkins</u> and <u>Anderson</u> accordingly does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims, and therefore does not support a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103.   Dependent claims 8-11 and 20-23 are respectfully believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

For the above reasons Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections based on <u>Coles</u>, <u>Perkins</u> and <u>Anderson</u> be withdrawn.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

  September 16, 2008   /David Dagg/
          Date   David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
                                              Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
                                              44 Chapin Road
                                              Newton, MA 02459
                                              (617) 630-1131